

REMARKS

This paper is submitted as a preliminary amendment in connection with a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) of the instant application. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action on the subject application. Claims 1-48 are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

As stated on page 2 of the Final Official Action dated 7 February 2005 (the "Action"), claims 1-11, 15-29, 33-43, and 47-48 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the white paper entitled "Understanding Universal Plug and Play" (hereinafter "MS"), in view of the document entitled "XML Schema Part 0: Primer" (hereinafter "W3C").

As stated on page 9 of the Action, claims 12-14, 30-32, and 44-46 stand rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over MS and W3C, further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,711,630 to Dubal, et al. (hereinafter "Dubal"). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections, and addresses each of these two rejections in detail below.

Turning first to the rejections stated on Page 2 of the Action, **Independent claim 1** is amended to clarify features of the recited method. These revisions are fully supported by the originally-filed specification under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 1st paragraph, at least by Figure 7 (particularly element 252), and by the written

description at: Table 4 bridging pages 26 and 27; page 27, line 1 through page 28, line 5; page 43, lines 10-19; and page 45, lines 14-15.

Independent claim 1 as amended above is reproduced here for convenience, with redlines included:

"1. (Currently Amended) A method of tuning an information presentation appliance comprising:

receiving user input specifying at least one categoryies of information to be presentedblocked from presentation on the appliance;

creating a device description page using a markup language;

storing data representing the categories of information specified by the user in the device description page; and

transmitting the device description page with the data representing the categories of information through a network."

In rejecting claim 1, the Office cited portions of the MS reference appearing on pages 1, 11, 16, 28, and 30. Even assuming for the sake of these comments that MS teaches remotely performing tasks such as setting the clocks on various UPnP-compatible appliances or operating a UPnP-compatible DVD using a control point, MS does not suggest or teach the features added above to claim 1. More particularly, even assuming that MS teaches displaying various content on devices, MS does not suggest or teach "receiving user input specifying at least one category of information to be *blocked from presentation on the appliance*", as now recited above in claim 1.

The Office cited W3C for various aspects of the XML Schema dealing with defining and naming groups of elements. However, even assuming that W3C provides this teaching, W3C does not teach or suggest the above feature now recited in claim 1.

These comments apply equally to claims 2-6, which depend from claim 1. In addition, dependent claims 5 and 6 are amended for consistency with claim 1, and to address informalities noted by Applicant. Further, in addition to the comments above directed to independent claim 1, from which claims 5 and 6 depend, MS and W3C do not disclose the features recited in claims 5 and 6. On at least this basis, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejections of claims 1-6.

Independent claim 7 is amended to clarify features of the recited method, and to recite features similar to those discussed above in connection with claim 1. These amendments are believed supported under § 112, 1st paragraph, on at least the same basis as were the revisions to claim 1. Portions of claim 7 as amended above are reproduced here for convenience, with redlines included:

"receiving user input at the information presentation appliance specifying selected categories of information to be blocked from presentation on the information presentation appliance; and

invoking a deliver function referenced by a service description page to receive an element of information belonging to a category other than the selected categories of information."

In rejecting claim 7, the Office cited substantially the same portions of MS and W3C as were cited in rejecting claim 1. However, even assuming that MS and W3C provide the teaching for which they are cited by the Office, MS and W3C do not disclose the above features now recited in claim 7. More particularly, MS and W3C do not disclose "receiving user input at the information presentation appliance specifying *selected categories of information to be blocked from presentation* on the information presentation appliance," and "invoking a deliver function referenced by a service description page to receive an element of information belonging to a category *other than the selected categories of information.*"

These comments apply equally to claims 8-11, which depend from claim 7. In addition, dependent claims 10 and 11 are amended for consistency with claim 7 and to address informalities noted by Applicant. Further, in addition to the comments above directed to independent claim 7, from which claims 10 and 11 depend, MS and W3C do not disclose the features recited in claims 10 and 11. On at least this basis, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejections of claims 7-11.

Independent claim 15 is amended to clarify features of the information presentation appliance, and to recite features similar to those discussed above in connection with claim 1. These amendments are believed supported under § 112, 1st paragraph, on at least the same basis as were the revisions to claim 1. A

portion of claim 15 as amended above is reproduced here for convenience, with redlines included:

“a user input device for enabling a user to specify categories of information to be presentedblocked from presentation on the information presentation appliance;”

In rejecting claim 15, the Office cited portions of the MS reference appearing on pages 1, 11, 16, 20, 28, and 30. Even assuming that the MS reference teaches some sort of user input device, as suggested in the Action, MS does not teach or disclose “a user input device for enabling a user to specify categories of information to be *blocked from presentation* on the information presentation appliance”, as now recited in claim 15. Applicant’s comments above regarding W3C apply equally to claim 15.

These comments apply equally to claims 16-22, which depend from claim 15. On at least this basis, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejections of claim 15-22.

Independent claim 23 is amended to clarify features of the information presentation appliance, and to recite features similar to those discussed above in connection with claim 1. These amendments are believed supported under § 112, 1st paragraph, on at least the same basis as were the revisions to claim 1. Portions of claim 23 as amended above are reproduced here for convenience, with redlines included:

"a user input device for performing steps comprising: receiving user input specifying selected categories of information to be blocked from presentation on the information presentation appliance; and

a processing unit for performing steps comprising:

parsing the device description page to identify available categories of information; and

invoking a deliver function referenced by a service description page to receive an element of information belonging to a category other than the selected categories of information."

In rejecting claim 23, the Office cited substantially the same portions of MS and W3C as were cited in rejecting claim 15. However, these portions of MS and W3C do not disclose the above features now recited in claim 23. Even assuming that the MS reference teaches some sort of user input device, as suggested in the Action, MS does not teach or disclose "a user input device for performing steps comprising: receiving user input specifying selected categories of information to be *blocked from presentation* on the information presentation appliance;", as now recited in claim 23. MS also does not teach "invoking a deliver function referenced by a service description page to receive an element of information belonging to a category *other than* the selected categories of information", as also recited in claim 23. Applicant's comments above regarding W3C apply equally to claim 23.

These comments apply equally to claims 24-29, which depend from claim 23. On at least this basis, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejections of claims 23-29.

Independent claim 33 is amended to clarify features of the computer-readable medium, and to recite features similar to those discussed above in connection with claim 1. These amendments are believed supported under § 112, 1st paragraph, on at least the same basis as were the revisions to claim 1. A portion of claim 33 as amended above is reproduced here for convenience, with redlines included:

"receiving user input specifying categories of information to be presentedblocked from presentation on the information presentation appliance;"

In rejecting claim 33, the Office cited substantially the same portions of MS and W3C as were cited in rejecting claim 1. However, these portions of MS and W3C do not disclose the above features now recited in claim 33. More particularly, even assuming that MS teaches categories involving a clock set application, as suggested in the Action, MS does not teach or suggest "receiving user input specifying categories of information to be *blocked from presentation* on the information presentation appliance", as now recited in claim 33. Applicant's above comments directed to W3C apply equally to claim 33.

These comments apply equally to claims 34-38, which depend from claim 33. On at least this basis, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejections of claims 33-38.

Independent claim 39 is amended to clarify features of the computer-readable medium, and to recite features similar to those discussed above in connection with claim 1. These amendments are believed supported under § 112, 1st paragraph, on at least the same basis as were the revisions to claim 1. Portions of claim 39 as amended above are reproduced here for convenience, with redlines included:

"receiving user input at the information presentation appliance specifying selected categories of information to be blocked from presentation on the information presentation appliance; and

invoking a deliver function referenced by a service description page to receive an element of information belonging to a category other than the selected categories of information."

The processes recited in claim 39 are based on the elements recited in claim 7. In rejecting claim 39, the Office cited substantially the same portions of MS and W3C as were cited in rejecting claim 7. However, these portions of MS and W3C do not disclose the above features now recited in claim 33, for at least the same reasons as were discussed above in connection with claim 7.

These comments apply equally to claims 40-43 and 47-48, which depend from claim 39. On at least this basis, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejection of claims 39-43 and 47-48.

Turning now to the § 103 rejections stated on page 9 of the Action, claims 12-14 depend from independent claim 7, and the comments directed above to claim 7 thus apply equally to claims 12-14. Likewise, claims 30-32 depend from independent claim 23, and the comments directed above to claim 23 thus apply equally to claims 30-32. Finally, claims 44-46 depend from independent claim 39, and the comments directed above to claim 39 thus apply equally to claims 44-46.

Applicant agrees that MS and W3C both fail to disclose using pointers to access the service description information, so the Office cited Dubal for this teaching. However, even assuming that the cited portions of Dubal teach obtaining pointers, Dubal does not teach or suggest the features added to each of the independent claims 7, 23, and 39, as discussed in more detail above. On at least this basis, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejections of claims 12-14, 30-32, and 44-46.

Applicant has also corrected informalities appearing in claims 12, 27, 30, and 44.

Conclusion

Applicant requests prompt and favorable action on this application at the earliest convenience of the Office. If any issue remains unresolved that would

prevent allowance of this case, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney to resolve the issue.

Respectfully Submitted,

By:

Date: 26 APR 05

Rocco L. Adornato
Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Reg. No. 40,480
(509) 324-9256 ext. 257